(6)

1892.

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE.

REVENUE.

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 19*th May* 1892.

No. 3098-105. / Cir. 31.

Directing the Deputy Commissioners to see that registries are made in the names of actual possessors of lands.

Mysore Govt. C. Press, Bangalore.—28-5-92.—120.

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, (Revenue),—dated 19th May 1892.

No. 3098-105—Cir. 31, DATED BANGALORE, 19TH MAY 1892.

ORDER.—A considerable number of petitions received by Government relate to the sale of lands held by unregistered holders for arrears of revenue. The Government have reason to think that there are still a large number of raiyatwari lands which are held by individuals whose names are not registered in the Revenue Accounts either because the holders have by ignorance not claimed separate registry in their names, or because the registered holders have raised frivolous objections to the registry being transferred to the actual possessors. In all such cases, it would be a great gain to the raiyats if the Deputy Commissioners would explain the rules on the subject to the parties concerned and see that the registries are made in the names of the actual possessors under paras 8 and 10 of Rule XXVI of the Revenue Rules. The Deputy Commissioners are therefore requested to make it a point at each Jamabandi to enquire how many such cases exist in each village, explain to the men concerned the rules on the subject and effect transfers of registry in the names of the persons actually in possession. They should explain in their Revenue Administration Report of 1892-93, how far effect has been given to the above instructions and how many cases still remain in which the registry still stands in the names of persons not actually in possession.

T. ANANDA ROW,
Chief Secretary.

To—The Deputy Commissioners of Districts.

Exd.—A.N.S.

P.F. 5095

G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references.

1894-95

192 .

(L.R.)

File No. 146 of 94

Serial Nos. 1-5

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1-5

Major **Part B for** July 1895

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Nagenna & Siddanakoth. Munigal Talk, Bagalkot Taluka, Bijapur Dist.

WD 2283—GPB—20,000—14-6-20

Counterparts

Ch. 1895

5

3

Petition No 2536 of 94-95

Petitioner

Chandra Nagamma

Counter Petitioner.

Shanthoj Sudarayi.
(Respondent)

Appeal against the order of the Deputy Commr of Tumkur declining to register the Patta of a certain land from the name of Counter Petitioner in favour of Petitioner

---

List of papers.

(1) Deputy Commr's report
(2) Official Memorandum calling for report
(3) Appeal petition with annexures
(4) District Registrar's judgment
(5) Endorsement issued by the Amildar
(6) Copy of Govt Order No $\frac{\text{RD 95 LRC 94}}{\text{Cir 31}}$ dt 17.5.95

Order on transfer
mm
24/7/95

2-7-95

Gen. Serial No. 321

1895

No. [illegible]

Name of Petitioner. [illegible]

Village. Beedanahalli

Taluk. Nandi

District. Bangalore

Date of Arzi. 30-5-95

Date of Receipt. 1-6-95

Date of Disposal.

No. of Enclosures. 3

L.R. 146-94-1

ABSTRACT.

[illegible]

(7)

(General Serial No. 30.)

1895.

OFFICE OF THE
13-830
31 MAY 1895
DEWAN MYSORE

Pet: 648

From

The Deputy Commissioner
Tumkur District

To

The Chief Secretary to the ~~Dewan~~ Govt
of Mysore.

Dated 17th May 1895

Despatched

Received A.R. 146-94-3

Enclosures No. 2 Files

General No. 996
No.

His official memorandum
No. Pel 1473 dated the 17th April
1895.

Reporting on the petition
of Chatrada Nayanna of
Beechanahalli in the
Kunigal Taluk.

Submitted to the Rev. Commissioner

6 The sale deed in favor of Petr
dated 24 Jany 1894. It recites receipt
consideration mentioned therein, Rs. 50,
makes transfer of possession, & promises
transfer of warg.

Before the Sub Regr, the Respondent,
who, denied execution, but on appeal
the Registrar ordered ~~execution~~ registration
whereupon the doct was registered.

The Respt now admits execution,
urges that a sum of Rs. 75 not mentioned
the document is due to him. He
admits that the vendee (Petr) is in
possession & paid last years Kandayam.

The Amildar was of opinion that
Respts objection to the transfer of
was untenable, and that if any
was due to him he might go to
Civil Court. The Dy Comr considered
matter was not a fit case in which
action of mamuls could be ordered in
summary enquiry & referred Petr
Civil Court.

The Petr urges that the Dy Comr's
is opposed to Govt Go. No. 3098-105/31
May 1892, & clauses 8 & 10 of
26 of the Rev. Rules.

A copy of the Govt Go. is put up
(C.C. Cl. 5 of Addl Rules).

C
Postponed & reports
in the ~~Dy~~ call concerned

8/6/95

Reports
Postponed 2nd July - notices 5th
issued early

12/6

R Ry Manchi
20/5/95

No: 996
Enc: 2 files

Deputy Commissioner's Office,
Tumkur District.
Dated 17th May 1895.

To
The Chief Secretary to the
Government of Mysore.

Sir,

With reference to your official memorandum No: Pol 1473 dated the 17th April 1895, forwarding for report (with the record of the case) the petition of Chatrada Nayanna of Beechanahalli in the Kunigal Taluk appealing against the order of this office declining to make the patta of survey No: 158 in the said village in his name, I have the honor to state as follows:-

2. The petitioner requested that, as he had purchased the land in question from Shanbog Subbaraya &c for 50 Rupees under a registered deed of sale

Pet 1473

(2)

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE,

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Petition No. 2536
dated 30-3-95 received at the
Dewan's Office from Chikka
Thayamma of Beeha
halli, Kunig al
Taluk praying that
Re thirty seven ho
Re-146-94-2 [illegible]
[illegible]
is forwarded, together with its
enclosures, to the
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
[illegible]
2 - The petition with
its enclosures should
be returned

By Order,

Asst. Chief Secretary

BANGALORE, 189

12-4
25

M.G.P.P.B.—19-2-95—1,000

20/4

22/4

said and had no jurisdiction to
grant right, as per clause 3 of
section 30 of the Revenue Court, the
Landgrave of his name. - that an
Injunction injected to the Landgra-
on the ground of non payment of
the consideration money it was thought
proper to refer the parties to civil
Court in preference to summary
disposal on the Revenue side and
accordingly the petitioners Revenue was
rejected. -

3. The appeal petition with an
enclosure received with the memo under
reply and the record of the case ending with
this office order Proceedings dated the 8th
December 1893 are herewith submitted

I have the honor to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant.

Deputy Commissioner



(5)

No 2536
1/14

MYSORE BANK'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT
REG'D. NO. 2536 OF 1897
DATE 1-4-98 95

2.

3.

4.

5.

6.

7.

8.

9.

10.

11.

12.

13.

14.

15.

16.

17.

18.

19.

20.

21.

22.

23.

24.

25.

26.

27.

28.

29.

30.

31.

32.

33.

34.

35.

36.

37.

38.

39.

40.

41.

42.

43.

44.

45.

46.

47.

48.

49.

50.

51.

52.

53.

54.

55.

56.

57.

58.

59.

60.

61.

62.

63.

64.

65.

66.

67.

68.

69.

70.

71.

72.

73.

74.

75.

76.

77.

78.

79.

80.

81.

82.

83.

84.

85.

86.

87.

88.

89.

90.

91.

92.

93.

94.

95.

96.

97.

98.

99.

100.

12 (4)

Proceedings of the Board of Revenue

K.R. 116-96-4

Read:—

(1) Petition No. 250 dated 30th August 1895 presented by Thattiara Narayana of Bichanahalli, Kunigal Taluk, appealing against the order of the Deputy Commr. of Tumkur declining to transfer the Patta of S.No 158 in Bichanahalli, from the name of the Counter Petitioner Lakkaya & that of the Petitioner

(2) Letter No. 990 dated 17th May 96, from the Deputy Commr. of Tumkur, reporting that, as Lakkaya objected to the transfer on the ground of non payment of consideration it was thought proper to refer the parties to a Civil Court, in preference to summarily disposed of the revenue side.

before the Amildar, the Counter Petitioner admitted the execution of the document, and the fact of Petitioner's possession and enjoyment of the land but urged that a sum of Rs 75, not mentioned in the document, had not been paid to him.

2. The Counter Petitioner did not appear at the hearing of this appeal, though he was duly served with notice. His objection to the transfer of Patta to the Petitioner's name does not appear to have ~~been made by him~~ ~~and the Government~~ directed that the Patta be transferred to the name of the Petitioner, under the provisions of clause 8, section XXVI of the Revenue Rules.

6.7.95

6.7.95

6/7/95

Revenue Secretary

Deputy Commr
may be directed with records.

enable. It is exactly
case of this kind which
is provided for by
rule 8 of Sec XXVI of the
Rules and where
a person held by
Patta is supported
by a duly executed
registered docu-
ment the Patta is
entitled to have the
Patta transferred
his name -
order of the
Commissioner
it is hereby

(3) The Records received with the above.

—a—

Order thereon. Re 313/P.Z.6-35 } 6.7.35

The Counsel Petitioner Sudanya, the owner and Pattadar of the land, sold it to Petitioner for Rs 50 under a Registered sale deed dated 24th January. The Counsel Petitioner denied execution of the document before the Sub Registrar, but failed to appear before the District Registrar, when the matter went before that officer on appeal. After Registration of the document under the orders of the District Registrar the Petitioner applied to the Amildar for transfer of Varg to his name in accordance with the terms of the document, and in the course of the enquiry before

(5)

25-36

I.R. 146-94-S-15

24-7-95